

Applicant : Kalahasti Chenchu Indukumar et al.
Serial No. : 09/941,106
Filed : August 28, 2001
Page : 7 of 8

Attorney Docket No.: 09819-003001 / TW/PSC/D.5493/012

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 05 2005

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 9, added claims 31-39, and cancelled claims 6, 12-18, and 26. More specifically, Applicants have corrected two spellings in claim 1, and have rectified informalities in claims 7 and 9. Applicants have also added claims 31-39, which all depend from claim 1. No new matter has been introduced. Indeed, claims 31, 32, and 33 are identical to claims 3, 4, and 5, respectively, except that they depend from claim 1 instead of claim 2. Similarly, claims 34-39 are identical to claims 19-24 except that they depend from claims 31 or 32 instead of claims 3 or 4.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 19-25, and 27-39 are now pending. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested in view of the remarks below.

The Examiner rejected claim 26 as being identical to its parent claim 6. See the Office Action, page 2, lines 2-4. The Examiner also rejected claims 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the prior art of record. See the Office Action, page 2, lines 20-21.

Applicants have cancelled all these rejected claims.

The Examiner concluded that claims 6, as well as claims 11, 23-25, and 27-30, is not anticipated by the prior art of record, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. See the Office Action, page 5, lines 7-13. Applicants have incorporated all the limitations of claim 6 into claim 1 such that claim 1 as amended has the same scope as claim 6. This amendment has necessitated cancellation of claim 6.

Applicants submit that amended claim 1, identical in scope to allowable claim 6, is now in condition for allowance. For the same reason, all the other pending claims, which depend from amended claim 1 either directly or indirectly, are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Based on the remarks set forth above, Applicants submit that all claims, as amended, cover allowable subject matter, and should be allowed. Early allowance by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

Note that the total number of claims, after accounting for the cancelled claims, is the same before and after the amendment. Thus, no excess claim fees are believed to be necessary.

JAN. 5. 2005 6:03PM

(2)-FISH&RICHARDSON_6175428906

NO. 3496 P. 9

Applicant : Kalahasthi Chenchu Indukumar et al. Attorney Docket No.: 09819-003001 / TW/PSC/D.5493/012
Serial No. : 09/941,106
Filed : August 28, 2001
Page : 8 of 8

In any event, please apply any other charges to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket 09819-003001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1-5-05

Y. Rocky Tsao
Y. Rocky Tsao, Ph.D., J.D.
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34,053

PTO Customer No. 26161
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21000488.doc